



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/059,077	04/09/1998	GREGORY E. JOHNSTON		8143
23586	7590	01/27/2005		EXAMINER
ROBERT E MALM				NGUYEN, LUONG TRUNG
16624 PEQUENO PLACE				
PACIFIC PALISADES, CA 90272			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2612	

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/059,077	JOHNSTON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	LUONG T NGUYEN	2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11,14,15 and 17-25 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 12-13, 16 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/21/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In re page 7, Applicants argue that Clendenin et al. does not disclose a camera that can both pan and tilt as claim 1 specifies.

In response, the Examiner considers that Clendenin et al. does disclose this feature. Clendenin et al. discloses the sight assembly 10, which includes television camera pickup system 20, 22, can track an object over  $\pm 160^\circ$  in azimuth (pan) and  $\pm 15^\circ$  in elevation (tilt), (figure 2, column 6, lines 1-16). This indicates that camera in Clendenin et al. can pan and tilt.

In re page 8, Applicants argue that Clendenin et al. does not disclose a "display-control box having an image display screen and control buttons for controlling said camera and its movement" as specified in claim 1.

In response, the Examiner considers that Clendenin et al. does disclose this feature. Clendenin et al. discloses a display-control box (combination of display 60, control panel 50, joystick 52, Figure 10, Column 5, Lines 50-65) having an image display screen (display 60, Figure 10, Column 5, Lines 50-67) and control buttons (control panel 50, joystick 52, Figure 10, Column 5, Lines 50-65) for controlling said camera and its movement (the operator, through the use of control panel 50, may control the sight assembly 10 (which contains television camera) manually to initiate tracking or to place sight assembly 10 into automatic tracking, Column 5, Lines 55-65, this indicates that the movement of the television camera is controlled.

In re page 8, Applicants argue that Clendenin et al. does not disclose a “display-control box being attached to an adjustable mount in said vehicle within an operator's view and reach”, as specified in claim 1.

In response, the Examiner considers that Clendenin et al. does disclose this feature. Clendenin et al. discloses control panel 50 and display 60 are collocated at the operator's position (being attached to an adjustable mount in said vehicle within an operator's view and reach), which may be, for example, in the cabin of the helicopter (Figure 10, column 2, Lines 55-60).

In re page 8, Applicants argue that Clendenin et al. does not disclose “an image capture box for receiving said captured mobile images” as specified in claim 1. And there is no motivation to combine Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al.

In response, the examiner considers that Lucas et al. discloses this feature.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In re page 9, Applicants argue that the prior art cited does not disclose the “fully-rotatable camera” limitation and “display-control box” limitation.

In response, the Examiner considers that Clendenin et al. does disclose “fully-rotatable camera” limitation and “display-control box” limitation. Clendenin et al. discloses the sight

assembly 10, which includes television camera pickup system 20, 22, can track an object over  $\pm$  160° in azimuth (pan) and  $\pm$  15° in elevation (tilt), (figure 2, column 6, lines 1-16). This reads on “fully-rotatable camera” limitation. Clendenin et al. discloses combination of display 60, control panel 50, joystick 52 (Figure 10, Column 5, Lines 55-67) as “display-control box”.

In re page 10, Applicants argue that Clendenin et al. does not disclose a system wherein the camera can be mounted at any angle with respect to gravity as specified in claim 1.

In response, the Examiner considers that Clendenin et al. does disclose this feature. Figures 2 and 3 of Clendenin et al. shows the sight assembly 10, which includes camera, can be mounted on a helicopter or a tank. This also shows that camera can be mounted at different position or angle. Therefore, Figures 2 and 3 read on claim 14.

In re page 11, Applicants argue that Clendenin et al does not disclose a display-control box which has a set of control buttons POSITIONED TO BE OPERATED WITH A SINGLE HAND as specified by claim 18.

In response, the Examiner considers that Clendenin et al. does disclose this feature. Clendenin et al. discloses the operator through the use of control panel 50, which includes joystick 52, control the sight assembly manually (Column 5, Lines 55-60). It should be noted that a single hand operates the joystick.

In re pages 11-12, Applicants argue that Clendenin et al does not disclose a display-control box having a viewing angle adjustment lever positioned to be operated with a single hand as specified by claim 19.

In response, the Examiner considers that Clendenin et al. does disclose this feature. Clendenin et al. discloses the operator through the use of control panel 50, which includes joystick 52, control the sight assembly manually (Column 5, Lines 55-60). It should be noted that a single hand operates the joystick. Clendenin et al. discloses the sight assembly 10, which includes television camera pickup system 20, 22, can track an object over  $\pm 160^\circ$  in azimuth (pan) and  $\pm 15^\circ$  in elevation (tilt), (figure 2, column 6, lines 1-16). This indicates that the control panel 50 and display 60 must have a view angle adjustment.

In re pages 12-13, Applicants argue that the prior art cited by the examiner does not disclose the limitation of claim 2.

In response, the Examiner considers that Clendenin et al. does not disclose “full rotation is achieved by mounting said camera to a tilting mechanism mounted on a panning mechanism.” However, Klapper discloses achieving a full rotation by mounting tilt gimbal 502 on pan gimbal 504 (Figures 2-3, Column 4, Lines 52-67).

In re pages 13-14, Applicants argue that Klapper et al. does not disclose a water seal attached to the tilting mechanism. The passage cited by the examiner (col. 13, lines 65-67) refers to a “water-resistant case”, not the tilting mechanism.

In response, the Examiner considers that Klapper et al. does disclose this feature.

Klapper et al. discloses camera 1104 uses a water-resistant case, and camera 1104 is mounted by a positioning mechanism 1105 providing tilting and panning mechanisms (Figure 16, Column 13, Line 65 – Column 14, Line 5). This indicates that a water seal attached to the tilting mechanism.

In re page 14, Applicants argue that Klapper et al. does not disclose a camera having a mounting assembly adapted for use with commercially-available roof-rack systems.

In response, regarding claim 6, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a camera having a mounting assembly adapted for use with *commercially-available roof-rack systems*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Instead, the Applicants recited in claim 6 the limitation “wherein said mount assembly is adapted to engage the roof-rack of a vehicle.” The Examiner considers that Klapper et al discloses this feature as shown in Figure 1.

In re page 15, Applicants argue that “The adjective “singular” in the context of applicants' invention means that both the pan mechanism and the tilt mechanism are supported at only one end of the axis of rotation. Klapper et al. does not disclose singular support for either the pan or the tilt mechanism.”

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *The adjective “singular” in the context of applicants' invention means that both the pan mechanism and the tilt mechanism are supported at only one end of the axis of rotation*) are not recited in the rejected

claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In this case, regarding claim 10, Applicants recited in the claim the limitation “a singular support for both said panning mechanism and said tilting mechanism.” Klapper et al. discloses this feature. Klapper et al. discloses pointing mechanism 500 (a singular support) includes tilt gimbal 502 and pan gimbal 504 (Figure 3, Column 5, Lines 52-67, Column 5, Lines 45-46).

In re page 15, Applicants argue that Klapper et al. does not disclose the slip clutches specified in claim 10.

The Examiner considers that Klapper et al. does disclose slip clutches. Klapper et al. discloses the slip ring and brush assembly 536 as slip clutches (Figures 3, 6, Column 5, Lines 30-39).

In re page 16, Applicants argue that Klapper et al. does not disclose the Klapper et al. does not disclose a camera having a mounting assembly which includes an adapter plate to mate to light bars used on emergency and patrol guard vehicles. Klapper et al. discloses custom mounting hardware 1012 that can secure a camera to the roof of a vehicle-not to the light bar of the vehicle.

In response, regarding claim 22, Applicants recited the limitation “ a mount assembly includes an adapter plate to mate to a light bar used on emergency and patrol guard vehicles.” The claim only recited “a light bar”. Therefore, the Examiner considers that the mounting hardware 1024 as shown in Figure 2 reads on claim 22.

In re page 17, Applicants argue that Klapper et al. does not disclose the Klapper et al. does not disclose Klapper et al. does not disclose a mount assembly which includes an adapter plate for ship-board attachment.

In response, regarding claim 24, Klapper et al. discloses a night vision camera 1101 mounted below the bridge of a marine vessel 1103. Therefore, this reads on “a mount assembly which includes an adapter plate for ship-board attachment.”

In re page 17, Applicants argue that Paddock et al. does not disclose a mount assembly which incorporates a quick disconnect mechanism which allows the mount assembly to be quickly disconnected from the vehicle to which it is attached. And there is no motivation to combine the references.

In response, regarding claim 3, the Applicants only recited the limitation “wherein said mount assembly incorporates a quick disconnect mechanism.” The Examiner considers that the quick release mechanism 70 (see Abstract, Column 7, Lines 27-30) in Paddock et al. still read on claim 3.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In re pages 18-19, the Applicants argue that the prior art does not disclose the limitation of claim 4.

In response, regarding claim 4, the Applicants recited in claim 4 the limitation “a double locking mechanism on said mount assembly where one mechanism is a security fastener.” The Examiner considers Paddock et al. does disclose this feature. Paddock et al. discloses the quick release mechanism includes two pins 76 and locking screw 77 (security fastener), Figures 6-7, Column 7, Lines 26-45).

In re pages 19-20, the Applicants argue that the prior art does not disclose the limitation of claim 8.

In response, regarding claim 8, the Applicants recited in claim 8 limitation “a ball-plunger for self-locking said amount assembly.” The Examiner considers Paddock et al. does disclose this feature. Paddock et al. discloses ball-plunger for self-locking said mount assembly. However, Paddock et al. discloses an adjustable platform includes a platform, a mounting plate, to which a camera is attached, and a quick release mechanism 70, which includes a ball-plunger 80 (Figures 6-7, Column 7, Lines 27-30).

In re pages 20-21, the Applicants argue that the prior art does not disclose the limitation of claim 8.

In response, regarding claim 9, the Applicants recited in claim 8 limitation “a security fastener as a secondary and operator activated mechanical locking mechanism for said mount assembly.” The Examiner considers Paddock et al. does disclose this feature. Paddock et al.

discloses locking screw 77 as a secondary security fastener (Figures 6-7, Column 7, Lines 26-45).

In re pages 21-22, the Applicants argue that the prior art does not disclose the limitation of claim 7. And Sclater does not disclose how to mount anything remotely like applicants' mount assembly on a THULE brand roof rack system.

In response, regarding claim 7, it is noted that the feature "how to mount anything remotely like applicants' mount assembly on a THULE brand roof rack system" is not a language claim. The Applicants only recited in claim 7 limitation "wherein said mount assembly is adapted to engage a THULE brand roof rack system." The Examiner considers Sclater does disclose this feature. Sclater discloses a vehicular roof-top collapsible display frame assembly for mobile advertising, which uses the well-known "Thule" or "Yakima" trademarked roof-top carriers (Column 3, Lines 45-53).

In re pages 22-23, the Applicants argue that the prior art does not disclose the limitation of claim 21. And Sclater does not disclose how to mount anything remotely like applicants' mount assembly on a YAKIMA brand roof rack system.

In response, regarding claim 7, it is noted that the feature "how to mount anything remotely like applicants' mount assembly on a YAKIMA brand roof rack system" is not a language claim. The Applicants only recited in claim 21 limitation "wherein said mount assembly mates to a YAKIMA brand roof rack system." The Examiner considers Sclater does disclose this feature. Sclater discloses a vehicular roof-top collapsible display frame assembly

for mobile advertising, which uses the well-known “Thule” or “Yakima” trademarked roof-top carriers (Column 3, Lines 45-53).

In re pages 23-24, the Applicants argue that the prior art does not disclose the limitation of claim 11.

In response, regarding claim 11, the Examiner considers that Kurian does disclose a slip clutch as claimed in claim 11. Kurian discloses an adjustable free motion friction clutch, which has a free rotation control, a friction disk 16, washer 24 (Figures 1-2, 5, Column 2, Lines 30-67).

In re pages 26-27, the Applicants argue that Baumeister does not disclose a bimetal heat sink as specified in claim 15.

In response, regarding claim 15, the Applicants recited the limitation “a bimetal heat sink for camera power supply temperature control.” The Examiner considers that Baumeister does disclose this feature. Baumeister discloses heat sink 14 which supports cooler 10 for cooling imager chip 8 (Figure 2, Column 3, Lines 55-63).

In re pages 27-28, the Applicants argue that the prior art does not disclose the limitation of claim 17.

In response, regarding claim 11, the Applicants recited the limitation “a camera enclosure incorporates a one-way moisture passage plug with flexible and sealed passage for wires.” The Examiner considers that Balkwill et al. does disclose this feature. Balkwill et al. discloses an electrical box, which prevents moisture from entering the box. The electrical box also includes a

plug and opening that receives a wire, which is sealed and resists moisture passage (Column 1, Lines 35-67).

In re page 28, the Applicants argue that Tovi does not disclose an optically clear or tinted enclosing a camera as specified in claim 20.

In response, regarding claim 20, the Applicants recited in claim 20 limitation “an optically clear or tinted sphere enclosing said camera.” The Examiner considers that Tovi does disclose this feature. Tovi discloses globe 12 is transparent at the lower part of the globe with the transparent film 56 (see Figure 2, Column 5, Lines 21-25). It is noted that the black paint 58 is only provided on the interior at the upper part of the globe 12, not covered the whole interior of the globe 12.

In re page 29, the Applicants argue that Yang does not disclose a camera mount assembly which is adaptable to a railroad locomotive attachment as specified in claim 23.

In response, regarding claim 23, the Applicants recited limitation “said mount assembly is adapted to a rail road locomotive attachment.” The Examiner considers that Yang does disclose this feature. Yang discloses a video surveillance train car, which includes camera 138 (Figure 17, Column 8, Lines 1-5). This reads on the limitation in claim 23.

In re pages 29-30, the Applicants argue that the cited prior art does not disclose the limitations of claim 25.

In response, it is noted that the Applicants do not specifically point out limitation which is not disclosed by the cited prior arts, therefore, the Examiner still consider that Clendenin et al., Lucas et al. and Kujirada disclose all the limitation in claim 25 as discussed below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 14, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clendenin et al. (US 4,386,848) in view of Lucas et al. (US 5,111,289).

Regarding claim 1, Clendenin et al. discloses a mobile pan and tilt camera and display-control apparatus comprising a fully rotatable camera attached to a mount assembly that is mounted to a vehicle for capturing mobile images (Sight assembly 10, which contains television camera, Figures 1-3, Column 5, Lines 49-60); a display-control box (combination of display 60, control panel 50, joystick 52, Figure 10, Column 5, Lines 50-65) having an image display screen (display 60, Figure 10, Column 5, Lines 50-67) and control buttons (control panel 50, joystick 52, Figure 10, Column 5, Lines 50-65) for controlling said camera and its movement (the operator, through the use of control panel 50, may control the sight assembly 10 (which contains television camera) manually to initiate tracking or to place sight assembly 10 into automatic tracking, Column 5, Lines 55-65; this indicates that the movement of the television

camera is controlled), said display-control box being attached to an adjustable mount in said vehicle within an operator's view and reach (Column 5, Lines 55-60).

Clendenin et al. fail to specifically disclose an image capture box for receiving said captured images. However, Lucas et al. discloses a vehicular-based surveillance system, which includes a video recorder 40 to record images captured by the video camera 22 (Figures 1-2, Column 1, Lines 50-60, Column 3, Lines 10-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Clendenin et al. by the teaching of Lucas et al. in order to provide own record of events of a person for private purposes, such as for providing proof of insurance claims (Column 1, Lines 24-27).

Regarding claim 14, Clendenin et al. discloses said camera may be mounted at any angle with respect to gravity (Figures 2-3).

Regarding claim 18, Clendenin et al. discloses said display and control system have a set of control buttons positioned to be operated with a single hand (Figure 10, Column 5, Lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 19, Clendenin et al. discloses said display and control system have a viewing angle adjustment lever positioned to be operated with said single hand (Figure 10, Column 5, Lines 55-60, Column 6, Lines 1-15).

4. Claims 2, 5-6, 10, 22, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clendenin et al. (US 4,386,848) in view of Lucas et al. (US 5,111,289) further in view of Klapper et al. (US 5,729,016).

Regarding claim 2, Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. fail to specifically disclose a full rotation is achieved by mounting said camera to a tilting mechanism mounted on a panning mechanism. However, Klapper et al. discloses camera pointing mechanism 500, which includes tilt gimbal 502, which is mounted on pan gimbal 504 (Figures 2-3, Column 4, Lines 52-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. by the teaching of Klapper et al. in order to allow camera to see the object at a different height. Due to the camera can pan or tilt at a different height; the camera can achieve a full rotation.

Regarding claim 5, Klapper et al. discloses a water seal attached to said tilting mechanism (water-resistant case, Column 13, Line 65 - Column 14, Line 5).

Regarding claim 6, Klapper et al. discloses the mount assembly is adapted to engage the roof-rack of a vehicle (Figure 1).

Regarding claim 10, Klapper discloses a singular support for both said panning mechanism and said tilting mechanism and separate drive gears (tilt drive gear 522, pan drive motor gear 544, Figure 3, Column 5, Lines 12-15, Lines 45-46) and slip clutches (slip ring and brush

assembly 536, Figures 3, 6, Column 4, Lines 52-67, Column 5, Lines 30-39) for both said panning mechanism and said tilting mechanism.

Regarding claim 22, Klapper et al. discloses said mount assembly includes an adapter plate to mate to a light bar used on emergency and patrol guard vehicles (Figures 1, 2, Column 1, Lines 25-27).

Regarding claim 24, Klapper et al. discloses said mount assembly includes an adapter plate for ship-board attachment (Figure 15).

5. Claims 3-4, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clendenin et al. (US 4,386,848) in view of Lucas et al. (US 5,111,289) further in view of Paddock et al. (US 5,737,657).

Regarding claim 3, Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. fail to specifically disclose the mount assembly incorporates a quick disconnect mechanism. However, Paddock et al. discloses an adjustable platform includes a platform, a mounting plate, to which a camera is attached, and a quick release mechanism (see Abstract, Column 7, Lines 27-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. by the teaching of Paddock et al. in order to allow the user to save time when attach or detach the mount assembly to or from a vehicle.

Regarding claim 4, Paddock et al. discloses a double locking mechanism on said mount assembly where one mechanism is a security fastener (quick release mechanism includes two pins 76 and locking screw 77 (security fastener), Figures 6-7, Column 7, Lines 26-45).

Regarding claim 8, Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. fail to specifically disclose a ball-plunger for self-locking said mount assembly. However, Paddock et al. discloses an adjustable platform includes a platform, a mounting plate, to which a camera is attached, and a quick release mechanism 70, which includes a ball-plunger 80 (Figures 6-7, Column 7, Lines 27-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. by the teaching of Paddock et al. in order to lock the mount assembly.

Regarding claim 9, Paddock et al. discloses a security fastener as secondary and operator activated mechanical locking mechanism for said mount assembly (quick release mechanism includes two pins 76 and locking screw 77 (security fastener), Figures 6-7, Column 7, Lines 26-45).

6. Claims 7, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clendenin et al. (US 4,386,848) in view of Lucas et al. (US 5,111,289) and Klapper et al. (US 5,729,016) further in view of Sclater (US 5,365,687).

Regarding claims 7 and 21, Clendenin et al., Lucas and Klapper et al. fail to specifically disclose said mount assembly is adapted to engage a THULE brand roof rack system or mates to

a YAKIMA brand roof rack system. However, Sclater discloses a vehicular roof-top collapsible display frame assembly for mobile advertising, which uses the well-known “Thule” or “Yakima” trademarked roof-top carriers (Column 3, Lines 45-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Clendenin et al., Lucas et al. and by the teaching of Paddock et al. in order to allow the user can attach the mount assembly to different type of vehicle.

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clendenin et al. (US 4,386,848) in view of Lucas et al. (US 5,111,289) and Klapper et al. (US 5,729,016) further in view of Kurian (US 5,762,556).

Regarding claim 21, Clendenin et al., Lucas et al. and Kappler et al. fail to specifically disclose said slip clutch comprises a rotationally free gear; a support housing for gear; a friction pad co-aligned to said gear between said gear and said support housing; a wave washer to apply a pressure against said rotationally free gear and said support housing of sufficient force to enable a motor to drive said gear and said support housing to a point where said support housing stops rotating and said rotationally free gear breaks friction of said friction pad while said motor continues to drive without overheating. However, Kurian discloses an adjustable free motion friction clutch, which has a free rotation control, a friction disc 16, washer 24, Figures 1-2, 5, Column 2, Lines 30-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Clendenin et al., Lucas et al. and Klapper et al. by the teaching of Kurian in order to provide an adjustable free motion friction clutch (Column 1, Lines 25-28).

8. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clendenin et al. (US 4,386,848) in view of Lucas (US 5,111,289) further in view of Baumeister (US 4,739,409).

Regarding claim 15, Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. fail to specifically disclose a bimetal heat sink for camera power supply temperature control. However, Baumeister discloses heat sink 14 support cooler 10 for cooling imager chip 8 (Figure 2, Column 3, Lines 55-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. by the teaching of Baumeister in order to keep the camera from overheating.

9. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clendenin et al. (US 4,386,848) in view of Lucas (US 5,111,289) further in view of Balkwill et al. (US 4,408,695).

Regarding claim 17, Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. fail to specifically disclose said camera enclosure incorporates a one-way moisture passage plug with flexible and sealed passage for wires. However, Balkwill et al. discloses an electrical box, which prevents moisture from entering the box. The electrical box also includes a plug and opening that receives a wire, which is sealed and resists moisture passage (Column 1, Lines 35-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. by the teaching of Balkwill et al. in order to prevent moisture from entering the camera housing. This prevents the damage of the camera.

10. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clendenin et al. (US 4,386,848) in view of Lucas (US 5,111,289) further in view of Tovi (US 4,225,881).

Regarding claim 20, Clendenin et al. and Lucas fail to specifically disclose an optically clear or tinted sphere enclosing said camera. However, Tovi discloses a transparent globe 12, which contains camera 30 (Figure 2, Column 4, Line 63 – Column 5, Line 29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. by the teaching of Tovi in order to

11. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clendenin et al. (US 4,386,848) in view of Lucas et al. (US 5,111,289) and Klapper et al. (US 5,729,016) further in view of Yang (US 4,578,665).

Regarding claim 23, Clendenin et al., Lucas and Klapper et al. fail to specifically disclose said mount assembly is adaptable to a rail road locomotive attachment. However, Yang discloses a video surveillance train car, which includes camera 138 (Figure 17, Column 8, Lines 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the mount assembly adaptable to a train car in order to attach the camera to the train car.

12. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clendenin et al. (US 4,386,848) in view of Lucas et al. (US 5,111,289) further in view of Kujirada (JP 10-304339).

Regarding claim 25, Clendenin et al. discloses a process for viewing a scene with mobile pan or tilt camera of claim 1 comprising the steps of mounting said camera to a vehicle for capturing mobile images (Sight assembly 10, which contains television camera, Figures 1-3, Column 5, Lines 49-60); displaying said images on an image display screen (display 60, Figure 10, Column 5, Lines 50-67); controlling said camera position from within said vehicle (control panel 50 is located at the operator's location, for example, in the cabin of a helicopter, Column 5, Lines 55-58).

Clendenin et al. fail to specifically disclose capturing said images in an image capture box for storage. However, Lucas et al. discloses a vehicular-based surveillance system, which includes a video recorder 40 to record images captured by the video camera 22 (Figures 1-2, Column 1, Lines 50-60, Column 3, Lines 10-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Clendenin et al. by the teaching of Lucas et al. in order to provide own record of events of a person for private purposes, such as for providing proof of insurance claims (Column 1, Lines 24-27).

Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. fail to specifically disclose transmission of said captured mobile images; and transmitting said captured mobile images by radio frequency transmission to a data storage server for further processing; and providing said captured mobile images on internet server for official or consumer access. However, Kujirada discloses a vehicle video providing system and virtual vehicle traveling system, in which video data from each vehicle 3-5 are transmitted through a radio communication network and an internet 1 to a video managing computer 2 (see Abstract, Figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Clendenin et al. and Lucas et al. by the teaching of Kujirada in order to provide video image to a remote location.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

13. Claims 12-13, 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUONG T NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 308-9297 or (571) 272-7315. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on (703) 305-4929 or (571) 272-7308. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LN LN  
1/22/05

  
TUAN HO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER